arXiv:math/0306428v1 [math.FA] 30 Jun 2003

A LOWER SEMICONTINUITY RESULT FOR SOME INTEGRAL FUNCTIONALS IN THE SPACE SBD

FRANÇOIS EBOBISSE

Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to study the lower semicontinuity with respect to the strong L^1-convergence, of some integral functionals defined in the space SBD of special functions with bounded deformation. Precisely, we prove that, if $u \in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$, $(u_h) \subset \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$ converges to u strongly in $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and the measures $|E^j u_h|$ converge weakly $*$ to a measure ν singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure, then

$$\int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u)\,dx \le \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\,dx$$

provided f satisfies some weak convexity property and the standard growth assumptions of order $p > 1$.

Keywords: functions with bounded deformation, integral functionals, lower semicontinuity, symmetric quasiconvexity.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35J50, 49J45, 49Q20, 74C15, 74G65.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Notation and preliminaries 3
3. The proof of the main result 8
4. Some examples and remarks 13
References 16

1. Introduction

Our goal in this paper is to extend in the framework of functions with bounded deformation, the following lower semicontinuity theorem by Ambrosio [2] for integral functionals defined in the space SBV of special functions of bounded variation.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and let $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ be a Carathéodory function satisfying:*

(i) *for a.e. every $x \in \Omega$, for every $(u, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$,*

$$|\xi|^p \le f(x, u, \xi) \le a(x) + \Psi(|u|)(1 + |\xi|^p),$$

where $p > 1$, $a \in L^1(\Omega)$ and the function $\Psi : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is continuous;

(ii) *for a.e. every* $x \in \Omega$ *and every* $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $f(x,u,\cdot)$ *is quasi-convex.*

Then for every $u \in SBV(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^k)$ *and any sequence* $(u_h) \subset SBV(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^k)$ *converging to* u *in* $L^1_{loc}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^k)$ *and such that*

$$\sup_h \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S_{u_h}) < \infty \tag{1.1}$$

we have

$$\int_\Omega f(x,u,\nabla u)\,dx \le \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x,u_h,\nabla u_h)\,dx.$$

Theorem 1.1 extends in the SBV setting a classical lower semicontinuity result by Acerbi-Fusco [1] in the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Later Kristensen in [19] extended Theorem 1.1 under the weaker assumptions

$$\sup_h \int_{S_{u_h}} \theta(|u_h^+ - u_h^-|)d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} < \infty \tag{1.2}$$

for some function θ such that $\theta(r)/r \to \infty$ as $r \to 0^+$, and f is a normal integrand, i.e., for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, $f(x,\cdot,\cdot)$ is lower semicontinuous in $\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ and there exists a Borel function $\tilde{f} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n\times k} \to [0,\infty]$ such that $f(x,\cdot,\cdot) = \tilde{f}(x,\cdot,\cdot)$.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1 as well as in the Acerbi-Fusco result, the use of Lusin type approximation of functions in the given space (BV or Sobolev spaces) by Lipschitz continuous functions is crucial.

Recently, Theorem 1.1 has been extended by Fonseca-Leoni-Paroni [17] to functionals depending also on the hessian matrices.

In this paper we deal with first order variational problem, but with integral functionals depending explicitely on the symmetrized derivative $Eu := (Du + Du^T)/2$ and defined in the space BD of functions with bounded deformation.

The main result of the paper is the following lower semicontinuity theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $p > 1$ *and Let* $f : \Omega \times \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}} \to [0,\infty)$ *be a Carathéodory function satisfying:*

(i) *for a.e. every* $x \in \Omega$, *for every* $\xi \in \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$,

$$\frac{1}{C}|\xi|^p \le f(x,\xi) \le \phi(x) + C(1+|\xi|^p),$$

for some constant $C > 0$ *and a function* $\phi \in L^1(\Omega)$;

(ii) *for a.e. every* $x_0 \in \Omega$, $f(x_0,\cdot)$ *is symmetric quasi-convex i.e.,*

$$f(x_0,\xi) \le \fint_A f(x_0,\xi + \mathcal{E}\varphi(x))dx \tag{1.3}$$

for every bounded open subset A *of* $\mathbb{R}^n$, *for every* $\varphi \in W^{1,\infty}_0(A,\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and* $\xi \in \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$.

Then for every $u \in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$, *for any sequence* $(u_h) \subset \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$ *converging to* u *strongly in* $L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $|E^j u_h|$ *converging weakly* $*$ *to a positive measure* ν *singular with respect to* *the Lebesgue measure, we have*

$$\int_\Omega f(x,\mathcal{E}u)\,dx \;\le\; \liminf_{h\to\infty}\int_\Omega f(x,\mathcal{E}u_h)\,dx.$$

In the literature there are various results on lower semicontinuity and relaxation of convex integral functionals in BD with linear growth in the strain tensor, in connection with elasto-plasticity problems (see [5, 23, 24, 9]). Concerning non convex functionals with linear growth we mention the papers [12, 6, 13]. As far as the author knows, there is no result on lower semicontinuity of non convex volume energies with superlinear growth in the strain tensor. So, Theorem 1.2 is the first lower semicontinuity result for this class of functionals.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows the lines of Theorem 1.1. We use the blow-up method introduced in [16] and described as a two-steps process whose first step here is the proof of a lower semicontinuity result whenever Ω is the unit ball $B(0,1)$, the limit function is linear and $|E^j u_h|(B(0,1))$ converge to zero (see Proposition 3.1). In a second step, we use a blow-up argument through the approximate differentiability of BD functions to reduce the problem into the first step.

The use of Lusin type approximation of BD functions by Lipschitz functions is crucial in the proof of Proposition 3.1. This result established in [11] and refined here in Proposition 2.8 is obtained using a "Poincaré type" inequality for BD functions (see Theorems 2.2 and 2.3) together with the maximal function of Radon measures.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we collect and prove some fine properties of BD functions that will be used in the proof of our main result. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2. In section 4, we discuss the assumption (in Theorem 1.2) that the measures $|E^j u_h|$ converge weakly $*$ to a positive measure ν singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. In Example 4.2, we consider a minimization problem in SBD with a unilateral constraint on the jump sets and we show that minimizing sequences satisfy the assumption on $|E^j u_h|$. However, this assumption is not always compatible with the SBD compactness criterion (Theorem 4.1). In fact, we construct in Example 4.4, a sequence of functions (u_h) which verifies the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 while $|E^j u_h|$ converge weakly $*$ to a measure proportional to the Lebesgue measure.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let $n \ge 1$ be an integer. We denote by $M^{n\times n}$ the space of $n\times n$ matrices and by $\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ the subspace of symmetric matrices in $M^{n\times n}$. For any $\xi \in M^{n\times n}$, ξ^T is the transpose of ξ. Given u, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u\otimes v$ and $u\odot v := (u\otimes v + v\otimes u)/2$ denote the tensor and symmetric products of u and v, respectively. We use the standard notation, $\mathcal{L}^n$ and $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ to denote respectively the Lebesgue outer measure and the $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure. For every set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\overline{E}$, $|E|$ and χ_E stand respectively for the closure of E, the Lebesgue outer measure of E and the charateristic function of E, that is $\chi_E(x) = 1$ if $x \in E$ and $\chi_E(x) = 0$ if $x \notin E$. For $1 \le p \le \infty$, $\|\cdot\|_p$ will denote the norm in the L^p space.

Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ We denote by $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ the family of Borel subsets of Ω. For any $x \in \Omega$ and $\rho > 0$, $B(x,\rho)$ denotes the open ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$ centered at x with radius ρ. When $x = 0$ and $\rho = 1$ we simply write B_1. We use the notation w_n for the Lebesgue measure of the ball B_1. If μ is a Radon measure, we denote $|\mu|$ its total variation.

Definition 2.1. *A function $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is with bounded deformation in Ω if $u \in L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $Eu := (Du + Du^T)/2 \in \mathcal{M}_b\big(\Omega, \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}\big)$, where Du is the distributional gradient of u and $\mathcal{M}_b\big(\Omega, \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}\big)$ is the space of $\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$-valued Radon measures with finite total variation in Ω.*

The space $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ of functions with bounded deformation in Ω was introduced in [20] and studied, for instance in [5], [18], [23], [24] in relation with the static model of Hencky in perfect plasticity. $\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space when equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{BD(\Omega)} := \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)} + |Eu|(\Omega)$$

where $|Eu|(\Omega)$ is the total variation of the measure Eu in Ω.
Whenever the open set Ω is assumed to be connected, the kernel of the operator E is the class of *rigid motions* denoted here by $\mathcal{R}$, and composed of affine maps of the form $Mx + b$, where M is a skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore $\mathcal{R}$ is closed and finite-dimensional.
Fine properties of BD functions were studied, for instance, in [4], [8] and [18]. The following "Poincaré type" inequality for BD functions has been proved by Kohn [18] (see also [4]).

Theorem 2.2. *Let Ω be a bounded connected open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with Lipschitz boundary. Let $R : BD(\Omega) \to \mathcal{R}$ be a continuous linear map which leaves $\mathcal{R}$ fixed.
Then there exists a positive constant $C(\Omega, R)$ such that:*

$$\int_\Omega |u - R(u)|dx \le C(\Omega,R)|Eu|(\Omega) \quad \textit{for any } u \in BD(\Omega). \tag{2.1}$$

When Ω is an open ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$ there is a precise representation of the rigid motion $R(u)$, given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $u \in BD(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\rho > 0$. Then there exists a vector $d_\rho(u)(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrix $A_\rho(u)(x)$ such that:*

$$\int_{B(x,\rho)} |u(y) - d_\rho(u)(x) - A_\rho(u)(x)(y - x)|dy \le C(n)\rho|Eu|(B(x,\rho)) \tag{2.2}$$

*where $C(n)$ is a positive constant depending only on the dimension n.
Moreover, $d_\rho(u)(x)$ and $A_\rho(u)(x)$ are expressed as singular integrals in the following ways:*

$$d^i_\rho(u)(x) := \sum_{l,m=1}^{n} \int_{|y-x|\ge\rho} \frac{\bigwedge^i_{lm}(y-x)}{nw_n|y-x|^n} dEu_{lm}(y); \tag{2.3}$$

$$A^{ij}_\rho(u)(x) := \sum_{l,m=1}^{n} \int_{|y-x|\ge\rho} -\frac{\Gamma^{lm}_{ij}(y-x)}{2w_n|y-x|^{n+2}} dEu_{lm}(y), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\bigwedge$ *and* Γ*, respectively third and fourth-order tensor valued functions, are defined and studied in* [18], [4].

We recall that if $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$, then the jump set J_u of u is a countably $(\mathcal{H}^{n-1}, n-1)$-rectifiable Borel set and the following decomposition of the measure Eu holds

$$Eu = \mathcal{E}u\mathcal{L}^n \,+\, E^s u = \mathcal{E}u\mathcal{L}^n \,+\, E^j u \,+\, E^c u\,, \tag{2.5}$$

where $E^j u := ([u] \odot \nu_u)\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner J_u$, $[u] := u^+ - u^-$, u^+ and u^- are the *one-sided Lebesgue limits* of u with respect to the measure theoretic normal ν_u of J_u, $\mathcal{E}u$ is the density of the absolutely continuous part of Eu with respect to $\mathcal{L}^n$, $E^s u$ is the singular part, and $E^c u$ is the *Cantor part* and vanishes on the Borel sets that are σ-finite with respect to $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ (see [4]).

Hereinafter we will use the following Proposition proved in [4, Proposition 7.8 and Remark 7.9].

Proposition 2.4. *Let* $K : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a* 0*-homogeneous function, smooth and with mean value zero on the unit sphere* $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$*. For any Radon measure* μ *with finite total variation in* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, let us define the functions*

$$h_\rho(x) := \int_{|y-x|\geq\rho} \frac{K(y-x)}{|y-x|^n}\, d\mu(y) \qquad \rho > 0.$$

Then the function $h(x) := \sup_{\rho>0} |h_\rho(x)|$ *satisfies the following weak* L^1 *estimate*

$$\big|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon\, h(x) > t\}\big| \leq \frac{C(n,K)}{t} |\mu|(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, if $\mu = f\mathcal{L}^n$ *with* $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, then the following strong* L^p *estimate holds*

$$\|h\|_p \leq C(n,K)\, \|f\|_p\,. \tag{2.7}$$

Let us also recall the theorem by Ambrosio-Coscia-Dal Maso [4] on the approximate differentiability of BD functions.

Theorem 2.5. *Let* Ω *be a bounded open set in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with Lipschitz boundary. Let* $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$*. Then for* $\mathcal{L}^n$ *almost every* $x \in \Omega$ *there exists an* $n \times n$ *matrix* $\nabla u(x)$ *such that*

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{B(x,\rho)} \frac{|u(y) - u(x) - \nabla u(x)(y-x)|}{\rho}\, dy = 0\,, \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{B(x,\rho)} \frac{|(u(y) - u(x) - \mathcal{E}u(x)(y-x), y-x)|}{|y-x|^2}\, dy = 0 \tag{2.9}$$

for $\mathcal{L}^n$*-almost every* $x \in \Omega$*.*

In particular, from (2.8) we have u is approximately differentiable $\mathcal{L}^n$-almost everywhere in Ω and from Proposition 2.4 it has been proved the function ∇u satisfies the weak L^1 estimate

$$\mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in \Omega\,:\, |\nabla u(x)| > t\}) \leq \frac{C(n,\Omega)}{t}\, \|u\|_{\mathrm{BD}(\Omega)} \quad \forall t > 0,$$

where $C(n,\Omega)$ is a positive constant depending only on n and Ω.
From (2.9) and (2.8) one can easily see that

$$\mathcal{E}u(x) = (\nabla u(x) + \nabla u(x)^T)/2 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^n\text{-a.e. } x \in \Omega. \tag{2.10}$$

Analogously to the space SBV introduced by De Giorgi and Ambrosio (see for instance [3]), the space SBD was introduced by Bellettini and Coscia in [7] and studied in [8].

Definition 2.6. *The space* SBD(Ω) *of* special functions with bounded deformation, *is the space of functions* $u \in \mathrm{BD}(\Omega)$ *such that the measure* $E^c u$ *in (2.5) is zero.*

We set

$$A(u)(x) := \sup_{\rho>0} |A_\rho(u)(x)|$$

with $A_\rho(u)$ the anti-symmetric matrix defined in (2.4). Note that for every $u \in SBD(\Omega)$, $A_\rho(u) = L_\rho(u) + J_\rho(u)$ with

$$L^{ij}_\rho(u)(x) := \sum_{l,m=1}^{n} \int_{|y-x|\geq\rho} -\frac{\Gamma^{lm}_{ij}(y-x)}{2w_n|y-x|^{n+2}} \mathcal{E}u_{lm}(y)dy \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$J^{ij}_\rho(u)(x) := \sum_{l,m=1}^{n} \int_{|y-x|\geq\rho} -\frac{\Gamma^{lm}_{ij}(y-x)}{2w_n|y-x|^{n+2}} dE^j u_{lm}(y). \tag{2.12}$$

We set also

$$L(u)(x) := \sup_{\rho>0} |L_\rho(u)(x)| \quad \text{and} \quad J(u)(x) := \sup_{\rho>0} |J_\rho(u)(x)|. \tag{2.13}$$

Let us also recall that, given a $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued Radon Measure μ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the maximal function of μ is defined by

$$M(\mu)(x) := \sup_{\rho>0} \frac{|\mu|(B(x,\rho))}{|B(x,\rho)|} \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Whenever $\mu = g\mathcal{L}^n$, we recover the maximal function of the function g (see [22]).

The following theorem is proved in [11].

Theorem 2.7. *Let* Ω *be either* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *or a Lipschitz bounded open subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *and* $u \in BD(\Omega)$. *Then for any* $\lambda > 0$, *there exists a Lipschitz continuous function* $v_\lambda : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *with* $lip(v_\lambda) \leq C\lambda$ *such that:*

$$\left|\{x \in \Omega \,:\, v_\lambda(x) \neq u(x)\}\right| \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \|u\|_{BD(\Omega)}, \tag{2.14}$$

where C *is a positive constant only depending on* n *or also on* Ω.

We can further refine the estimate (2.14) when the function $u \in SBD(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{E}u \in L^p(\Omega, \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let* $p \in (1,\infty)$ *and* $u \in SBD(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $\mathcal{E}u \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$. *For every* $\lambda > 0$ *there exists a function* $v_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *Lipschitz continuous with* $lip(v_\lambda) \le C\lambda$, $|v_\lambda(x)| \le C\lambda$ *for every* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, *and for any Borel subset* E *of* $\mathbb{R}^n$, *the following estimate holds*

$$\big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_\lambda(x) \ne u(x)\}\big| \le \frac{C}{\lambda}\big[||u||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^n)} + |E^j u|(E)\big] + \tag{2.15}$$

$$+\frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{L(u)(x)>\lambda\}} |L(u)(x)|^p dx + \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{M(|\mathcal{E}u|)>\lambda\}} [M(|\mathcal{E}u|)]^p dx.$$

where C *is a positive constant only depending on* n.

Proof. For $\lambda > 0$, we set

$$E_\lambda := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon M(|u|\mathcal{L}^n + |Eu|)(x) \le 3\lambda \text{ and } A(u)(x) \le 2\lambda\}.$$

It has been proved in Theorem 2.7 that $u|_{E_\lambda \setminus S_u}$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant less or equal to a positive constant proportional to λ. Moreover, from Lebesgue differentiation theorem we have also

$$|u(x)| \le 3\lambda \quad \forall x \in E_\lambda \setminus S_u.$$

The function v_λ is then obtained from $u|_{E_\lambda\setminus S_u}$ by Kirszbraun's Theorem (see Federer [15, Theorem 2.10.43]).
Now given $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, since $E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : v_\lambda(x) \ne u(x)\} \subset E \setminus (E_\lambda \setminus S_u)$, it is sufficient to estimate the measure of the Borel set $E \setminus (E_\lambda \setminus S_u)$.
Note that

$$\big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon A(u)(x) > 2\lambda\}\big| \le \big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon L(u)(x) > \lambda\}\big|$$
$$+ \big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon J(u)(x) > \lambda\}\big|$$

where L and J are defined in (2.13). From Proposition 2.4 and Chebychev inequality we get respectively

$$\big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon J(u)(x) > \lambda\}\big| \le \frac{C(n)}{\lambda}|E^j u|(E)$$

and

$$\big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon L(u)(x) > \lambda\}\big| \le \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{L(u)(x)>\lambda\}} |L(u)|^p dx.$$

So, we obtain

$$\big|E \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon A(u)(x) > 2\lambda\}\big| \le \frac{C(n)}{\lambda}|E^j u|(E) + \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{L(u)(x)>\lambda\}} |L(u)|^p dx. \tag{2.16}$$

On the other hand, using covering theorems (see [3], [15]) and the properties of maximal functions of L^p functions, we obtain the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|E\cap\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\colon\, M(|u|\mathcal{L}^n+|Eu|)(x)>3\lambda\}\big| \;\le\; \big|E\cap\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\colon\, M(|u|\mathcal{L}^n)(x)>\lambda\}\big| \\
&\qquad +\big|E\cap\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\colon\, M(E^ju)(x)>\lambda\}\big| \;+\; \big|E\cap\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\colon\, M(\mathcal{E}u)(x)>\lambda\}\big| \\
&\qquad \le\; \frac{C(n)}{\lambda}\big[||u||_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^n)}+|E^ju|(E)\big] \;+\; \frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{M(\mathcal{E}u)>\lambda\}}[M(\mathcal{E}u)]^p\,dx.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.17}$$

Therefore the estimate (2.15) is obtained by adding (2.16) to (2.17). □

Remark 2.9. Let Ω be a bounded connected open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with Lipschitz continuous boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let $u\in SBD(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{E}u\in L^p(\Omega,\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$. Let $\overline{u}$ be the extension of u by 0 outside Ω. We recall that

$$E\overline{u}=\mathcal{E}u\mathcal{L}^n\llcorner\Omega\;+\;E^ju\llcorner\Omega\;-\;\gamma(u)\odot\nu\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\llcorner\partial\Omega$$

where $\gamma(u)$ and ν are respectively the trace of u on $\partial\Omega$ and the outer unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. So, applying Proposition 2.8 to $\overline{u}$, we get the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|E\cap\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\,:\,v_\lambda(x)\neq\overline{u}(x)\}\big| \\
&\le\;\frac{C(n,\Omega)}{\lambda}\left[||u||_{L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)}+|E^ju|(\Omega\cap E)+\int_{\partial\Omega\cap E}|\gamma(u)\odot\nu|d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\right] \\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{L(u)\,>\,\lambda\}}|L(u)|^pdx\;+\;\frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{M(|\mathcal{E}u|)>\lambda\}}[M(|\mathcal{E}u|)]^p\,dx
\end{aligned}\tag{2.18}$$

for every $E\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In particular for any $E\in\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|E\cap\{x\in\Omega\,:\,v_\lambda(x)\neq u(x)\}\big|\;\le\;\frac{C(n,\Omega)}{\lambda}\big[||u||_{L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)}+|E^ju|(\Omega)\big] \\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{L(u)(x)\,>\,\lambda\}}|L(u)|^pdx\;+\;\frac{1}{\lambda^p}\int_{E\cap\{M(|\mathcal{E}u|)>\lambda\}}[M(|\mathcal{E}u|)]^p\,dx.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.19}$$

3. The proof of the main result

This section is essentially devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 where the following proposition will be crucial.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $f_h:\Omega\times\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}\to[0,\infty)$ *be a sequence of Carathéodory functions satisfying for a.e. every* $x\in\Omega$, *for every* $\xi\in\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$,

$$\frac{1}{C}|\xi|^p\;\le\;f_h(x,\xi)\;\le\;\phi_h(x)+C(1+|\xi|^p),$$

for some constant $C>0$ *and a sequence* (ϕ_h) *uniformly bounded in* $L^1(B_1)$. *Assume that there exist an* $\mathcal{L}^n$*-negligible set* $N\subset B_1$ *and a symmetric quasi-convex function* $f:\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}\to[0,\infty)$ *such that* $\lim_{h\to\infty}f_h(y,\xi)=f(\xi)$ *uniformly on compact subsets of* $\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ *and for any*

$y \in B_1 \setminus N$. Then, for any sequence (u_h) in $SBD(B_1)$ converging strongly in $L^1(B_1, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to a linear function u, with $\lim_{h\to\infty} |E^j u_h|(B_1) \to 0$, we have

$$\int_{B_1} f(\mathcal{E}u)\, dx \leq \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx.$$

Proof. Let $(u_h) \subset SBD(B_1)$ be a sequence which converges strongly in $L^1(B_1, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to a linear function u and $\lim_{h\to\infty} |E^j u_h|(B_1) \to 0$. Up to substituting u_h by $u_h - u$ and $f_h(x, z)$ by $f_h(x, z + \mathcal{E}u)$ we can assume that $u \equiv 0$. So, we have to prove that

$$|B_1| f(0) \leq \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx. \tag{3.1}$$

Up to a subsequence we assume that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx = \lim_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx < \infty.$$

So the sequence $(\mathcal{E}u_h)$ is uniformly bounded in $L^p(B_1, \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})$. We set

$$\Psi_h := [M(\mathcal{E}u_h)]^p + |L(u_h)|^p + |\phi_h| \tag{3.2}$$

where M is the maximal function and L is defined in (2.13). From the assumptions and from Proposition 2.4, we have that (Ψ_h) is a bounded sequence in $L^1(B_1)$. So, By Chacon Bitting Lemma (see for instance [3, Lemma 5.32]) there exist a subsequence of (Ψ_h) (still denoted (Ψ_h)) and a decreasing sequence of sets $(E_k) \subset \mathcal{B}(B_1)$ such that $|E_k| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and the sequence $(\Psi_h 1_{B_1 \setminus E_k})_h$ is equiintegrable for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We introduce the following modulus of equiintegrability for the sequence $(\Psi_h 1_{B_1 \setminus E_k})_h$

$$W_k(\delta) := \sup \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \limsup\limits_{h\to\infty} \displaystyle\int_F \Psi_h\, dx\colon\ F \in \mathcal{B}(B_1) \text{ with} \\ F \subset B_1 \setminus E_k \text{ and } |F| \leq \delta \end{array} \right\} \quad \forall \delta > 0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.3}$$

It follows that $W_k(\delta) \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$.

Now, from Proposition 2.8 and Remark 2.9 we have for any integer $m \geq 1$, a Lipschitz continuous function $v_{h,m} : \overline{B}_1 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and a set $E_{h,m} \in \mathcal{B}(B_1)$ such that

$$Lip(v_{h,m}) \leq C(n)m, \quad |v_{h,m}(x)| \leq C(n)m \quad \forall x \in \overline{B_1}, \quad v_{h,m} = u_h \text{ in } B_1 \setminus E_{h,m} \tag{3.4}$$

and for any Borel subset E of B_1 the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} \big|E_{h,m} \setminus E\big| \leq{}& \frac{C(n)}{m} \big[||u_h||_{L^1(B_1,\mathbb{R}^n)} + |E^j u_h|(B_1)\big] \\ &+ \frac{1}{m^p} \int_{\{L(u_h)(x) > m\} \setminus E} |L(u_h)(x)|^p dx + \frac{1}{m^p} \int_{\{M(|\mathcal{E}u_h|) > m\} \setminus E} [M(|\mathcal{E}u_h|)]^p dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

In particular for $E = E_k$ we get from the definition of Ψ_h that

$$\big|E_{h,m} \setminus E_k\big| \leq \frac{C(n)}{m} \big[||u_h||_{L^1(B_1,\mathbb{R}^n)} + |E^j u_h|(B_1)\big] + \frac{2}{m^p} \int_{\{\Psi_h > m^p\} \setminus E_k} \Psi_h\, dx. \tag{3.6}$$

We set $S := \sup_h ||\Psi_h||_1$. Using the fact that $\big|\{\Psi_h > m^p\}\big| \leq \frac{S}{m^p}$ together with $u_h \to 0$ strongly in $L^1(B_1, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $|E^j u_h|(B_1) \to 0$ (by assumptions), we get from (3.6) that

$$\limsup_{h\to\infty} m^p \big|E_{h,m} \setminus E_k\big| \leq 2W_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big). \tag{3.7}$$

From the inequality (3.7), it is easy to see (for m large enough) that

$$\limsup_{h\to\infty} \int_{E_{h,m}\setminus E_k} \phi_h \, dx \leq \limsup_{h\to\infty} \int_{E_{h,m}\setminus E_k} \Psi_h \, dx \leq 2W_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big).$$

Now from (3.4), it follows by Ascoli-Arzelà that the sequence $(v_{h,m})_h$ is relatively compact in $C(\overline{B}_1, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence, we get up to a subsequence, that for every integer $m \geq 1$, $v_{h,m}$ converges uniformly to a function $v_m \in C(\overline{B}_1, \mathbb{R}^n)$ as $h \to \infty$. Since, $|E_k| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, to get (3.1), it is enough to prove that

$$|B_1 \setminus E_k| f(0) \,\leq\, \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.8}$$

We have the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \geq \int_{B_1\setminus(E_{h,m}\cup E_k)} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \,&=\, \int_{B_1\setminus(E_{h,m}\cup E_k)} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \\ &= \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \,-\, \int_{E_{h,m}\setminus E_k} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \\ &\geq \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \,-\, \int_{E_{h,m}\setminus E_k} \phi_h dx - Cm^p\big|E_{h,m} \setminus E_k\big|.\end{aligned}$$

So, passing to the limit as $h \to \infty$, and using (3.6) and (3.7) we get that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \geq \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \,-\, CW_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big). \tag{3.9}$$

From the assumption of the convergence of $f_h(x, \xi)$ to $f(\xi)$, we get that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \geq \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f(\mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx. \tag{3.10}$$

Using the symmetric quasi-convexity of the function f, we get also that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f(\mathcal{E}v_{h,m})\, dx \geq \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f(\mathcal{E}v_m)\, dx. \tag{3.11}$$

Indeed, f symmetric quasi-convex means that $f \circ \pi$ is quasi-convex in the classical sense, where π is the projection on symmetric matrix. Since $lip(v_{h,m}) \leq C(\Omega, n)m$, it is easy to see that the $(v_{h,m})_h$ converges weakly $\star$ in $W^{1,\infty}(B_1, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to the function v_m and hence (3.11) follows from a classical lower semicontinuity theorem by Morrey (see for instance Dacorogna [10]).

Finally from (3.9), (3.10) and (3.11) we obtain that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \geq \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} f(\mathcal{E}v_m)\, dx - CW_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big). \tag{3.12}$$

On the other hand, from (3.7) we have also that

$$m^p\big|\{x \in B_1 \setminus E_k\colon\ v_m(x) \neq 0\}\big| \leq 2W_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big). \tag{3.13}$$

In fact, from the L^1-norm lower semicontinuity of the map

$$u \to \big|\{x \in B_1 \setminus E_k\colon\ |u|(x) \neq 0\}\big| \;=\; \int_{B_1\setminus E_k} \chi_{(0,\infty)}(|u|(x))dx,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} m^p\big|\{x \in B_1 \setminus E_k\colon\ v_m(x) \neq 0\}\big| \;&\leq\; \liminf_{h\to\infty} m^p\big|\{x \in B_1 \setminus E_k\colon\ (v_{h,m} - u_h)(x) \neq 0\}\big| \\ &=\; \liminf_{h\to\infty}\ m^p\big|E_{h,m} \setminus E_k\big| \;\leq\; 2W_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Now, setting $A_m := \{x \in B_1 \setminus E_k\colon\ v_m(x) \neq 0\}$, we obtain from (3.12) that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_{B_1} f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \geq \int_{B_1\setminus(E_k\cup A_m)} f(0)\, dx - CW_k\Big(\frac{S}{m^p}\Big) \tag{3.14}$$

So, passing to the limit in (3.12) as $m \to \infty$ and using (3.13) we finally obtain (3.8) and this achieves the proof of the proposition. □

Now we are in the position to prove our main result.

The proof of Theorem 1.2. Let (u_h) be a sequence such that u_h converges strongly to u in $L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $|E^j u_h|$ converges weak $*$ to the measure ν singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We assume that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \;=\; \lim_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \;<\; \infty.$$

So, up to a subsequence, the sequence of measures $f_h(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\mathcal{L}^n \llcorner \Omega$ converges weakly $*$ to a positive measure μ. To prove (1.4), it is enough to prove that

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x_0) \;\geq\; f(x_0, \mathcal{E}u(x_0)) \qquad \text{a.e. } x_0 \in \Omega. \tag{3.15}$$

In fact, from the lower semicontinuity of the total variations of measure with respect to weak $*$ convergence and from the inequality (3.15) it follows that

$$\liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u_h)\, dx \geq \mu(\Omega) \geq \int_\Omega \frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x)\, dx \geq \int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u(x))\, dx.$$

So, let us prove that (3.15) holds. To this aim, we use a characterization of Carathéodory functions by Scorza-Dragoni (see e.g. [14, Page 235]), to get for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ a compact set $K_i \subset \Omega$ such that $|\Omega \setminus K_i| < 1/i$ and $f|_{K_i\times \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}}$ is continuous in $K_i \times \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$. Let K_i^1 be the set of Lebesgue points of the function χ_{K_i}. We set

$$F := \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (K_i \cap K_i^1)$$

and it follows that $|\Omega \setminus F| \;\leq\; |\Omega \setminus (K_i \cap K_i^1)| \;=\; |\Omega \setminus K_i| \;\leq\; 1/i \to 0 \quad$ as $i \to \infty$.
Let us fix $x_0 \in F$ such that:

(i) x_0 is an approximate differentiability point of u and such that $\mathcal{E}u(x_0) = \frac{\nabla u(x_0)+\nabla u(x_0)^T}{2}$;

(ii) $\displaystyle \frac{d\nu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x_0) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{\nu(B(x_0,\varepsilon))}{|B(x_0,\varepsilon)|} = 0$;

(iii) $\displaystyle \frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x_0) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x_0,\varepsilon))}{|B(x_0,\varepsilon)|} < \infty$.

Now, we consider a sequence $\varepsilon_k \searrow 0^+$ such that $\nu(\partial B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)) = 0$ and $\mu(\partial B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)) = 0$. Note that such a sequence exists since $\{\varepsilon > 0\colon\ \nu(\partial B(x_0,\varepsilon)) > 0,\ \nu(\partial B(x_0,\varepsilon)) > 0\}$ is at most a countable set.

From the approximate differentiability of u at x_0 and the fact that $u_h \to u$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ we get

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\lim_{h\to\infty} ||u_{k,h} - w_0||_{L^1(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0 \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$u_{k,h} := \frac{u_h(x_0+\varepsilon_k y) - u(x_0)}{\varepsilon_k} \quad \text{and} \quad w_0(y) := \nabla u(x_0)y.$$

We have also that

$$\begin{aligned} |E^j u_{k,h}|(B_1) &= \int_{B_1\cap J_{u_{k,h}}} \big|(u^+_{k,h} - u^-_{k,h}) \odot \nu_{u_{k,h}}\big| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ &= \varepsilon_k^{-n} \int_{B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)\cap J_{u_h}} \big|(u^+_h - u^-_h) \odot \nu_{u_h}\big| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \\ &= \frac{|E^j u_h|(B(x_0,\varepsilon_k))}{\varepsilon_k^n} \le \frac{|E^j u_h|(\overline{B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)})}{\varepsilon_k^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty} |E^j u_{k,h}|(B_1) &\le \limsup_{k\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty} \frac{|E^j u_h|(\overline{B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)})}{\varepsilon_k^n} \\ &\le \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{\nu(\overline{B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)})}{\varepsilon_k^n} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

On the other hand, setting $f_k(y,\xi) := f(x_0+\varepsilon_k y,\xi)$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x_0) &\ge \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{\mu(\overline{B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)})}{|B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)|} \\ &\ge \limsup_{k\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty} \frac{1}{|B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)|} \int_{B(x_0,\varepsilon_k)} f(x,\mathcal{E}u_h)\,dx \\ &\ge \limsup_{k\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty} \frac{1}{w_n} \int_{B_1} f(x_0+\varepsilon_k y,\mathcal{E}u_{k,h})\,dy \\ &= \limsup_{k\to\infty}\limsup_{h\to\infty} \frac{1}{w_n} \int_{B_1} f_k(y,\mathcal{E}u_{k,h})\,dy. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by a standard diagonalization argument we may extract a subsequence $v_k := u_{k,h_k}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} ||v_k - w_0||_{L^1(B_1,\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0, \qquad \lim_{k\to\infty} |E^j v_k|(B_1) = 0$$

and

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x_0) \,\geq\, \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{w_n}\int_{B_1} f_k(y,\mathcal{E}v_k)\,dy.$$

Now, since $x_0 \in F$, there exist $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_0 \in K_{i_0} \cap K^1_{i_0}$. So, the sequence $\chi_{\frac{K_{i_0}-x_0}{\varepsilon_k}}$ converges strongly to 1 in $L^1(B_1)$ and hence, up to a subsequence $\chi_{\frac{K_{i_0}-x_0}{\varepsilon_k}}(y) \to 1$ for a.e. $y \in B_1$. So, for k large enough we have that $x_0 + \varepsilon_k y \in K_{i_0}$ for a.e. $y \in B_1$. Hence, for every $\xi \in \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ we get $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(x_0+\varepsilon_k y,\xi) = f(x_0,\xi)$ for a.e. $y \in B_1$. Therefore, we get for a.e. $y \in B_1$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} f_k(y,\xi) \,=\, f(x_0,\xi) \tag{3.18}$$

locally uniformly in $\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}$. So, applying Proposition 3.1 to the sequence (v_k), we get that

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^n}(x_0) \,\geq\, \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{w_n}\int_{B_1} f_k(y,\mathcal{E}v_k)\,dy \,\geq\, \frac{1}{w_n}\int_{B_1} f(x_0,\mathcal{E}u(x_0))\,dy \,=\, f(x_0,\mathcal{E}u(x_0))$$

which gives (3.15) and achieves the proof of the theorem. □

4. Some examples and remarks

In the proof of Theorem 1.2, the assumption on $|E^j u_h|$ has played a crucial role in order to perform the blow-up argument. Note that any sequence $(u_h) \subset W^{1,p}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $u_h \to u$ strongly in $L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies trivially the assumptions of the theorem. For examples of sequences which are not necessary in $W^{1,p}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$, we consider here a variational problem with a uniform L^∞ constraint on the admissible functions and a unilateral constraint on their jump sets.

Let us recall here the compactness criterion in *SBD* by Bellettini-Coscia-Dal Maso [8].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\phi : [0,+\infty[\to [0,+\infty[$ be a non-decreasing function such that*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{\phi(t)}{t} = +\infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Let (u_h) be a sequence in $SBD(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |u_h|dx + |E^j u_h|(\Omega) + \int_\Omega \phi(|\mathcal{E}u_h|)dx + \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(J_{u_h}) \leq C \tag{4.2}$$

for some positive constant C independent of h.

Then there exists a subsequence, still denoted by (u_h) and a function $u \in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$ such that

$$u_h \to u \text{ strongly in } L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.3}$$

$$\mathcal{E}u_h \rightharpoonup \mathcal{E}u \text{ weakly in } L^1(\Omega,\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}), \tag{4.4}$$

$$E^j u_h \rightharpoonup E^j u \text{ weakly } \star \text{ in } \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega,\mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}}), \tag{4.5}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(J_u) \le \liminf_{h\to+\infty} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(J_{u_h}). \tag{4.6}$$

In the next example we consider a variational problem for which the minimizing sequences satisfy the assumption on $|E^j u_h|$ in Theorem 1.2.

Example 4.2. Let $K \neq \emptyset$ be a non closed subset of Ω such that $0 < \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(K) < \infty$ and let $\{F(x)\}_{x\in\Omega}$ be a family of uniformly bounded closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We consider the following variational problem:

$$\min_{\substack{u\in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)\\ J_u\subset K\\ u(x)\in F(x)\text{ a.e. in }\Omega}} \int_\Omega f(x,\mathcal{E}u)\,dx \tag{4.7}$$

with the function f satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. Let us prove that Problem (4.7) admits a solution.
By the rectifiability of jump sets of BD functions, the inclusion $J_u \subset K$ will be intended up to a $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-negligible set.

Let $(u_h) \subset \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$ be a minimizing sequence for problem (4.7). By the assumptions, there exists $M > 0$ such that $||u_h||_\infty \le M$

$$|E^j u_h|(\Omega) \le 2||u_h||_\infty \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(J_{u_h}) \le 2M\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(K) < \infty \tag{4.8}$$

and hence by the growth assumptions of f, (4.2) is satisfied with $\phi(t) = t^p$. By Theorem 4.1, u_h converges (up to a subsequence) strongly in $L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ to some function $u \in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$. Hence we get also $u(x) \in F(x)$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

On the other hand, the sequence $|E^j u_h|$ converges (up to a subsequence) weakly $\star$ to some positive measure ν. It easily follows from (4.8) that the measure ν is concentrated on the set K. Therefore ν is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. So, by Theorem 1.2, we have that

$$\int_\Omega f(x,\mathcal{E}u)\,dx \le \liminf_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x,\mathcal{E}u_h)\,dx.$$

Now let us prove that u verifies the constraint $J_u \subset K$ up to a $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-negligible set. This is obtained by slicing. To this aim we recall the notations for one-dimensional sections of BD functions.

Given $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\xi \neq 0$, we set

$$\pi^\xi := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n\colon\ (y,\xi) = 0\}$$

and for every $y \in \pi^\xi$ and for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$,

$$B^\xi_y := \{t \in \mathbb{R}\colon\ y + t\xi \in B\} \quad \text{and} \quad B^\xi := \{y \in \pi^\xi\colon\ B^\xi_y \neq \emptyset\}.$$

For every $u \in L^1(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n)$ we set

$$u^\xi_y(t) := (u(y + t\xi), \xi).$$

It has been proved in [4] that, if $u \in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$ then for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. $y \in \Omega^\xi$, $u^\xi_y \in \mathrm{SBV}(\Omega^\xi_y)$. Viceversa, assume that

$$u^\xi_y \in \mathrm{SBV}(\Omega^\xi_y) \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^{n-1}\text{-a.e. } y \in \Omega^\xi \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega^\xi} |Du^\xi_y|(\Omega^\xi_y) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) < \infty$$

for every $\xi = \xi_i + \xi_j$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$, with $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^n$ being an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then $u \in \mathrm{SBD}(\Omega)$.
Setting $J^\xi_u := \{x \in J_u\colon\ (u^+(x) - u^-(x), \xi) \neq 0\}$, it follows from Fubini's theorem that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\big(J_u \setminus J^\xi_u\big) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{n-1}\text{-a.e. } \xi \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

From the structure theorem for BD functions (see [4, theorem 5.1]) we have also

$$J_{u^\xi_y} = \big(J^\xi_u\big)^\xi_y \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in \Omega^\xi.$$

Now we can prove that the limit u of the minimizing sequence (u_h) for Problem (4.7) satifies the constraint $J_u \subset K$.
Let $\xi \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ be such that (4.9) holds. Following the proof of Theorem 4.1, we get that the sequence of one-dimensional section $(u^\xi_{h,y})$ of the minimizing sequence (u_h) satisfies the assumptions of the SBV compactness theorem and from $J_{u_h} \subset K$ we get

$$J_{u^\xi_{h,y}} = (J^\xi_u)^\xi_y \subset K^\xi_y \text{ with } \mathcal{H}^0(K^\xi_y) < \infty \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^{n-1}\text{-a.e. } y \in \Omega^\xi.$$

Therefore the limit function u^ξ_y has also its jump set contained in the finite set K^ξ_y. In fact, it is easy to see that the jump set $J_{u^\xi_y}$ is contained in the set of limits of the jump points of $u^\xi_{h,y}$. Now from $(J^\xi_u)^\xi_y = J_{u^\xi_y} \subset K^\xi_y$ for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. $y \in \Omega^\xi$, we get $J^\xi_u \subset K$ up to a $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-negligible set and hence by (4.9), also $J_u \subset K$ up to a $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-negligible set. □

Remark 4.3. Note that the set K has been taken non closed in order to avoid the easy case where the minimizing sequences (u_h) and their limit u belong to the space

$$LD(\Omega \setminus K) := \{u \in L^1(\Omega \setminus K, \mathbb{R}^n)\colon\ Eu \in L^1(\Omega \setminus K, \mathrm{M}^{n\times n}_{\mathrm{sym}})\}$$

for which the lower semicontinuity of the functional

$$\int_\Omega f(x, \mathcal{E}u)\, dx = \int_{\Omega\setminus K} f(x, \mathcal{E}u)\, dx$$

in the strong topology of $L^1(\Omega \setminus K, \mathbb{R}^n)$ follows from [12, Theorem 3.1].

As we have seen in the previous example, the minimizing sequences for problem (4.7) satisfy the assumptions of both Theorems 1.2 and 4.1. However, unlike the assumptions (1.1) in Theorem 1.1 and (1.2) in [19], which are consistent with the compactness criterion in SBV (see for instance [3, Theorem 4.8]), the assumption of Theorem 1.2 on the measures $|E^j u_h|$ is not always compatible with the compactness criterion in Theorem 4.1.

In the following example, we construct a sequence $(u_h) \subset SBD(\Omega)$ which satisfies the compactness criterion in SBD while $|E^j u_h|$ converges to a measure proportional to the Lebesgue measure.

Example 4.4. We consider in $\mathbb{R}^2$ the open squares

$$\Omega := (0,2) \times (0,2) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_h := \Big(\frac{1}{h} - \frac{1}{h^2}, \frac{1}{h} + \frac{1}{h^2}\Big) \times \Big(\frac{1}{h} - \frac{1}{h^2}, \frac{1}{h} + \frac{1}{h^2}\Big).$$

We set

$$E_h := \bigcup_{(i,j)\in I_h \times I_h} \big(\Omega_h + (i,j)\big) \quad \text{with} \quad I_h := \{0, 2/h, 4/h, \cdots, 2-2/h\}.$$

Let (u_h) be the sequence defined by $u_h := (\chi_{E_h}, 0)$ and let $E_{h,i,j} := \Omega_h + (i,j)$. By easy computations we get

$$E^j u_h = E u_h = \sum_{(i,j)\in I_h \times I_h} (1,0) \odot \nu_{E_{h,i,j}} \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \partial E_{h,i,j}$$

where $\nu_{E_{h,i,j}}$ is the unit normal vector to $\partial E_{h,i,j}$.

We have that $|E^j u_h|(\Omega) = 2\sqrt{2} + 4$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(J_{u_h} \cap \Omega) = 8$. Thus, the sequence (u_h) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.1.

However, the sequence $|E^j u_h|$ converges weakly $*$ to the measure $(\sqrt{2}+2)\mathcal{L}^2 \llcorner \Omega$. Indeed, let $M_h^{i,j}$, $N_h^{i,j}$ and $L_h^{i,j}$, $K_h^{i,j}$ be respectively the two vertical and horizontal sides of the square $E_{h,i,j}$. It is easy to see that

$$|E^j u_h| = \sum_{(i,j)\in I_h \times I_h} \Big(\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner M_h^{i,j} + \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner N_h^{i,j} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L_h^{i,j} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner K_h^{i,j}\Big). \tag{4.10}$$

Now let $\varphi \in C_c(\Omega)$. It is easy to see that

$$\lim_{h\to\infty} \sum_{(i,j)\in I_h \times I_h} \int_{S_h^{i,j}} \varphi d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_\Omega \varphi \, dx \quad \text{for } S_h^{i,j} = M_h^{i,j}, N_h^{i,j}, K_h^{i,j}, L_h^{i,j}. \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore from (4.10) and (4.11) we get

$$\lim_{h\to\infty} \int_\Omega \varphi \, d|E^j u_h| = (\sqrt{2}+2) \int_\Omega \varphi \, dx.$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The author is grateful to Luigi Ambrosio for helpful discussions on the subject of the paper. This work is supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa.

REFERENCES

[1] Acerbi E., Fusco N.: Semicontinuity problems in the calculus of variations, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **86** (1984), 125-145.

[2] Ambrosio L.: On the lower semicontinuity of quasi-convex integrals in $SBV(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^k)$, *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* **23** (1994), 405-425.

[3] Ambrosio L., Fusco N., Pallara D.: *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems* Clarendon Press, Oxford, (2000).

[4] Ambrosio L., Coscia A., Dal Maso G.: Fine properties of functions with bounded deformation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **139** (1997), 201-238.

[5] Anzellotti G., Giaquinta M.: Existence of the displacement field for an elasto-plastic body subject to Henky's law and Von Mises' yield condition. *Manuscripta Math.* **32** (1980), 101-131.

[6] Barroso A.C., Fonseca I., Toader, R.: A relaxation theorem in the space of functions of bounded deformation *Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa* **29** (2000), 19-49.

[7] Bellettini G., Coscia A.: Una caratterizzazione dello spazio $BD(\Omega)$ per sezioni unidimensionali *Seminario di Analisi Matematica, Dip. Mat. Univ. Bologna,* Anno Acc. 1992-93 123-129.

[8] Bellettini G., Coscia A, Dal Maso G.: Special functions of bounded deformation *Math. Z.* **228** (1998), 337-351.

[9] Braides A., Defranceschi A., Vitali, E.: A relaxation approach to Hencky's plasticity *Appl. Math. Optim* **35** (1997), 45-68.

[10] Dacorogna B.:*Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*, Springer, 1989.

[11] Ebobisse F.: A Lusin type approximation of BD functions. *Proc. Royal Soc. Edin. A* **129** (1999), 697-705.

[12] Ebobisse F.: On lower semicontinuity of integral functionals in $LD(\Omega)$. *Ric. di Matematica* **49** (2000), 65-76.

[13] Ebobisse F., Toader R.: A note on the integral representation of functionals in the space $SBD(\Omega)$, *Rend. Mat. (7)*, in press.

[14] Ekeland I., Temam R. *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*, North-Holland Publishing Company (1976).

[15] Federer H.: *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer, Berlin (1969).

[16] Fonseca I. and S. Müller: Quasi-convex Integrands and the Lower semicontinuity in L^1, *SIAM J. Math. Analysis*, **23** (1992), 1081-1098.

[17] Fonseca I., Leoni G., Parroni R.: On lower semicontinuity in BH^p and 2-quasiconvexification, Preprint 01-CNA-013 2001.

[18] Kohn R. V.: *New Estimates for Deformations in terms of their Strains*, PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 1979.

[19] Kristensen J.: Lower semicontinuity in spaces of weakly differentiable functions, *Math. Ann.* **313** (1999) 653-710.

[20] Matthies H., Strang G., Christiansen E.: The Saddle Point of a Differential Program. *Energy Methods in Finite Element Analysis*, Wiley, New York, 1979.

[21] Morini M.: Private comunication.

[22] E.M. Stein: *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1970.

[23] Suquet P. M.: Un espace fonctionnel pour les équations de la plasticité. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse* **1** (1979), 77-87.

[24] Temam R.: *Problèmes Mathématiques en Plasticité*. Gauthier-Villars, 1983.

Department of Maths and Applied Maths, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, 7700 South Africa

E-mail address: `ebobisse@maths.uct.ac.za`